



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/600,390

06/20/2003

Avijit Chatterjee

ROC920030238US1

7557

46797

7590

11/02/2006

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1  
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH  
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

HARPER, LEON JONATHAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2166

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/600,390		CHATTERJEE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Leon J. Harper		2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,11-19,21-27 and 29-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,11-19,21-27 and 29-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/20/03</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed 8/22/2006 has been entered. Only claims 9, 11-18 and 25 remain pending in this application, all other claims have been canceled.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 9, 11-18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 20040205545 (hereinafter Bar) in view of US 6519603 (hereinafter Bays) and in further view of US 5537526 (hereinafter Anderson), and in further view of US5253362 (Nolan).

As for claim 9 Bar discloses: one or more applications for manipulating data (See paragraph 0021); an annotation store for storing annotations created for data manipulated by the one or more applications (See paragraph 0025 lines 9-10) an annotation browser configured to access the annotation store and provide one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing annotations for data manipulated by the one or more (See paragraph 0025).

While Bar does not differ substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure of an annotation browser is not necessarily explicit. Bays however does explicitly disclose an annotation browser (See column 7 lines 9-12). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Bays into the system of Bar. The modification would have been obvious because if users are annotating different types of content (See background of Bar) then a browser to scan or flip through the annotations is a necessary element to help users search for content based on the annotations and not the type of data.

The combination of Bar and Bays while not differing substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure of an annotation browser configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects and wherein selecting the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked. Anderson however does disclose an annotation browser configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects (See column 5 lines 6-11); and wherein selecting the links to the associated data

Art Unit: 2166

objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked (See column 4 lines 36-40), while Nolan discloses storing annotations (See column 5 lines 16-20: note the annotation must be stored). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Anderson and Nolan into the system of Bar and Bay. The modification would have been obvious because when users share data it is often desirable to be able to find related or associated annotated documents and being able to link to documents is the best way to show through annotations that two documents are related to give other users a better idea of how the annotation relates to the document (See Bays column 1 lines 17-20).

As for claim 11 the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Bays discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display data and indications of what displayed data has one or more corresponding annotations (See column 7 lines 32-35 note that the data is being displayed as well and the indicators are attached to the bar).

As for claim 12 the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and further Anderson discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display one or more annotation icons proximate to an annotated data object (See Anderson column 4 lines 64-66). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Anderson into the system of Bar and Bay. The modification would have been obvious because when users share data it is often

Art Unit: 2166

desirable to be able to find related or associated annotated documents and being able to link to documents is the best way to show through annotations that two documents are related to give other users a better idea of how the annotation relates to the document (See Bays column 1 lines 17-20).

As for claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein: at least one common annotation describes more than one data object (See figure 6 and column 5 lines 51-55), and the annotation browser is configured to display a common annotation icon proximate to data objects described by the common annotation (See column 5 lines 60-65 notes the nurses notes hold annotations).

As for claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display different annotation icons proximate to data objects described by different annotations (See figure 5 and note that you are going to get a different view depending on what the annotation is).

As for claim 15, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has a single annotation and a second annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has multiple annotations (See column 5 line 60-

Art Unit: 2166

column 6 line 4 and noting that icon is in a cell and will display differently depending on the annotation) .

As for claim 16, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first portion of annotation data from an annotation, in response to a user positioning a cursor over an associated annotation icon (See Figure 5 “showing details” ).

As for claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated, and further Nolan disclose: wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, display a second portion of annotation data from the annotation (See figure 6 “expanded annotations”).

As for claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, retrieve the second portion of annotation data from the annotation store (See figure 6 and note that annotations are contained within the local data storage).

As for claim 25 Bar discloses: an annotation database for storing annotations separately from the data sources associated with the annotations (See paragraph



Art Unit: 2166

0025); a set of annotatable data objects points defining portions of data sources associated with the annotations described by the associated annotations (See paragraph 0026 anchor=point). A set of structures, each defining a set of annotation fields (See paragraph 0028) a set of plug-in component, each for interfacing between one or more applications and an annotation server (See paragraph 0163); an annotation server configured to receive, via the plug-in components, request to access annotations for one or more of the annotatable data object points issued by the one or more applications running on the silent computer and generated a graphical user interface screen , based on the annotation structure associated with the one or more of the annotatable data object points, for creating or viewing annotations for one or more annotatable data object points (See paragraph 00163 for sever configuration and See paragraph 0025); and a browser is configured to access annotations in the annotation store independently of the applications in which the annotations were created (See paragraph 0025).

While Bar does not differ substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure of a web based browser and providing links to annotated data objects wherein selecting the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked is not necessarily explicit. Bays however does explicitly disclose a web based browser (See column 7 lines 9-12) while Anderson discloses providing links to annotated data objects wherein selecting the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked (See column 4 lines 36-40). It would have been obvious to an



Art Unit: 2166

artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Bays and Anderson into the system of Bar. The modification would have been obvious because if users are annotating different types of content (See background of Bar) then a browser to scan or flip through the annotations is a necessary element to help users search for content based on the annotations and not the type of data.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 8/22/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

#### **Applicant argues:**

The references fail to teach at least an annotation browser configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects wherein selecting the links to the associated data objects causes an applicant used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked as claimed in independent claims 9 and 25. The system disclosed in Anderson may use links to associate an annotation with parts of a document to which an annotation refers. These links are not displayed to a user, however, as recited in claims 9 and 25.

**Examiner responds:**

Examiner is not persuaded. Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. Interpretation of Claims- Broadest Reasonable Interpretation during patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969). In this case there is not explicit requirement that the links be displayed to a user.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2166

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LJH  
Leon J. Harper  
October 27, 2006

  
MOHAMMAD ALI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER